

### REMARKS

This Amendment and Declaration Pursuant to Rule 131 are submitted in response to outstanding Office Action wherein Examiner rejected claims 1-29, all the claims in the application. Reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and Declaration submitted herewith and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

An Applicant submits amendments to claims 1 and 12 in an effort to describe this invention more clearly. Consistent with this, claims 9 and 11, now deemed redundant have been cancelled. Claims 13 and 15 have also been withdrawn in view of the amendments to claim 12. In an effort to remove further redundancy from the application, claims 16-29 have been cancelled. These claims are considered to be duplicative of the claims being maintained in the application. A new claim 30 has been added.

Prior to discussing the prior art rejections, applicant takes this opportunity to set for the following brief remarks in connection with the claim bladder supply and eversion apparatus and easement unit claimed.

The apparatus described and claimed in the application are particularly well suited for use in the installation of pull in and inflate cured in place liners. The resin impregnated liner is pulled into the conduit to the lined and a bladder stored on a spool in a pressure bladder canister is everted into the liner by pressurized air introduced into the canister and at the elbow. After the bladder reaches the distal access point and an exhaust hose installed, flow-through air and/or steam is introduced into the bladder to cure the resin. The bladder is then removed by rewinding the bladder onto the spool.

The apparatus described and claimed includes a powered reel within the pressurized canister to control the speed of the everting bladder as well as provide for rewinding the bladder following cure. This allows for control of the rate of inflation. It is significant when everting with air as the air is a compressible fluid. These features are now set forth in currently amended claim 1. Similarly, these features are set forth in currently amended claim 12 directed to the displaceable easement unit carrying the bladder supply and eversion apparatus.

Applicant respectfully submits that the features of the apparatus including the powered bladder spool in combination with provision for feeding air and/or steam adding to the eversion elbow are features not shown or suggested in the prior art. None of the references cited includes a powered reel within a pressurized bladder canister as described and claimed in the application. For this reason, applicant respectfully submits that the amended claims 1-14 and 30, all the claims remaining in the application, are patentable and in condition for immediate allowance.

Turning now to the prior art rejections, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 10, 16-22 and 24 directed to the bladder supply and eversion apparatus under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Driver et al. (No. 6,708,728) in view of Keist Jr. (No. 5,816,293). Examiner then rejected claims 9, 11, 23 and 25, also directed to the canister and bladder apparatus based on the combination of Driver and Keist, and further in view of Shishkin et al. (No. 4,758,115).

The Examiner considered that Driver et al. disclosed the claimed invention except for the pressurized bladder canister. Keist Jr. is relied on for teaching a pressurized canister. The Examiner concludes that it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to provide a pressurized canister as taught by Keist Jr. to facilitate installation of a pipe one liner. This rejection is being reviewed with a further rejection over Shishkin et al. in view of the amendments introducing limitation previously set forth into claims 9 and 11 into amended claim 1. Here, the Examiner repeated the prior rejections and considered Shishkin et al. to teach use of the spool. As to the motor, Examiner considers it obvious to facilitate loading or unloading of the spool without reference to any teaching to do so in the prior art.

This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Applicant submits herewith a Declaration of Franklin Thomas Driver pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.131. The effective date of the Driver et al. reference is its July 17, 2001 filing date. The accompanying Driver Declaration establishes conception of the invention prior to July 17, 2001, the effective date of the reference, coupled with due diligence from that date to the filing of the parent application on August 10, 2001, some 24 days later.

Applicant respectfully submits that the showing in these Declarations establish at least conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the Driver et al. reference. In view of this, Driver et al. is no longer an effective reference in view of the fact that the Examiner relies on Driver et al. as the principal reference, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of the claims must fail. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims 1-11 and 30, all the remaining claims directed to the eversion apparatus.

Applicant further submits that notwithstanding the prior invention, the claims in their own are patentable over Driver in view of Keist whether considered alone or in combination or in further view of Shishkin. None of the prior art show or suggest use of a pressurized canister including a powered spool as set forth in the claims. The apparatus described in Driver is complete utilizing glands to provide the pressurized system. Keist on the other hand merely utilizes a pressurized tank with a folded supply of liner that would be everted without control in view of the absence of a powered spool. With respect to the use of the motor, Examiner has failed to site any teaching to utilize in a pressurized canister of the type utilized by applicants.

For these reasons, applicant respectfully submits the remaining claims directed to the eversion apparatus are deemed patentable over Driver, Keist or Shishkin whether considered alone or in the combination as suggested by the Examiner. Thus, the rejections should be withdrawn and the claims to the eversion apparatus allowed.

Finally, the Examiner rejected claims 12-15 and 26-29 directed to the easement unit over Keist in view of Shishkin. Examiner considered that Keist disclosed the invention, but for the spool. He turns to Shishkin to provide a spool in a pressurized canister. Examiner concludes it would have been obvious to provide a spool with a pressurized canister as taught by Shishkin. With respect to the motor Examiner considers it obvious to utilize notwithstanding the lack of any teaching in the cited prior art.

This rejection is respectfully traversed and deemed insufficient for the reasons set forth with respect to the claims directed to the eversion apparatus.

Serial No. 10/760,513

May 16, 2005

Reply to Office Action of December 15, 2004

In view of the amendments to claims 12-14, applicant respectfully submits that these remaining claims directed to the easement unit carrying the canister and elbow are indeed patentable over the combination of Keist and Shishkin for the reasons set forth. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection and allow claims 12-14.

Applicant has made a sincere effort to address all of the issues raised by the Examiner. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application and accompanying Declaration at an early date with a view towards issuing a favorable action thereon. If upon review of the application, the Examiner is unable to issue an immediate Notice of Allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney with a view towards resolving the outstanding issues.

Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Michael I. Wolfson

Reg. No. 24,750

Attorney for Applicant

GREENBERG TRAURIG LLP

200 Park Avenue

New York, NY 10166

Tel.: (212) 801-9200

Fax: (212) 801-6400



DATE: July 23, 2001

## MEMORANDUM

TO: AIM 2001 IMPROVEMENT TEAM

CC:

FROM: Tom Driver

RE: Orland Park Demo "D" Briefing Meeting Action Items

### ACTION ITEMS

Description	Responsible Party	Completed by
Change steam boiler from <u>off@16psi on@3psi</u> to <u>off@15psi on@12psi</u>	Kurt Schlake	On or before August 6, 2001 <b>ON SCHEDULE</b>
Change out boiler purge card from one minute to 15 second	Kurt Schlake	On or before August 6, 2001 <b>COMPLETED</b>
Make muffler drain system for exhaust line at receiving manhole	Brad Schwerdt	On or before August 6, 2001
Review steam trap/condensate drain location and size to improve removal of condensate from bladder during cure.	Kurt Schlake & Brad Schwerdt	On or before August 6, 2001 <b>COMPLETED</b>
Add steam trap/condensate drain to receiving canister	Brad Schwerdt & Weiping Wang	<b>ASAP COMPLETED</b>
Test existing small diameter turning machine for inversion of AIM PP inflation bladder	Weiping Wang, Joe Coyne & Tom Driver	<b>ASAP COMPLETED</b>
Rework turning machine so it can be mounted on easement machine and be used for Air/Steam installation of AIM	Kurt Schlake, Weiping Wang, Joe Coyne & Tom Driver, Brad Schwerdt	ASAP, but no later then August 1, 2001 <b>COMPLETED</b>
Determine upper limits of catalyst for AIM Air/Steam cure using PP bladder.	Bill Moore, Weiping Wang	On or before August 6, 2001 <b>ON SCHEDULE</b>
Development method to determine when bladder is fully de-inverted.	Weiping Wang & Brad Schwerdt	On or before August 6, 2001
Development method of installing a 5psi relief valve on exhaust line, receiving canister, that will prevent bladder pressure from falling below 5 psi during cure cycle. <u>NOTE valve will have to be bypassed during bladder inversion and de-inversion.</u>	R. C. Polivka, Brad Schwerdt & Tom Driver	On or before August 6, 2001
Develop Work Instruction for installing AIM using turning machine for bladder inversion and Air/Steam cure.	Tom Driver	On or before August 10, 2001